

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

Sharmarlo Tinch,
Plaintiff
v.
Nevada Parole Board,
Defendant

Case No. 2:22-cv-02037-JAD-BNW

Order Dismissing and Closing Case

9 Plaintiff Shararlo Tinch brings this civil-rights lawsuit to redress constitutional
10 violations that he claims he suffered in conjunction with his parole being revoked. On January
11 27, 2023, this court ordered the plaintiff to either pay the \$402 filing fee or file a complete
12 application to proceed in forma pauperis by March 30, 2023.¹ That deadline expired, and Tinch
13 did not pay the fee, file a complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, or otherwise
14 respond.

15 District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of
16 that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case.² A
17 court may dismiss an action based on a party’s failure to obey a court order or comply with local
18 rules.³ In determining whether to dismiss an action on this ground, the court must consider:
19 (1) the public’s interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court’s need to manage its

¹ ECF No. 3.

²² *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986).

²³ *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

1 docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of
 2 cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.⁴

3 The first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously resolving this litigation and the
 4 court's interest in managing its docket, weigh in favor of dismissal of the plaintiff's claims. The
 5 third factor, risk of prejudice to defendants, also weighs in favor of dismissal because a
 6 presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in prosecuting an
 7 action.⁵ The fourth factor—the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits—is
 8 greatly outweighed by the factors favoring dismissal.

9 The fifth factor requires the court to consider whether less drastic alternatives can be used
 10 to correct the party's failure that brought about the court's need to consider dismissal.⁶ Courts
 11 "need not exhaust every sanction short of dismissal before finally dismissing a case, but must
 12 explore possible and meaningful alternatives."⁷ Because this court cannot operate without
 13 collecting reasonable fees, and litigation cannot progress without a plaintiff's compliance with
 14 court orders, the only alternative is to enter a second order setting another deadline. But issuing
 15 a second order will only delay the inevitable and further squander the court's finite resources.

16
 17
 18⁴ *In re Phenylpropanolamine Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 460 F.3d 1217, 1226 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting
 19 *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 130).

20⁵ *See Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976).


21⁶ *Yourish v. Cal. Amplifier*, 191 F.3d 983, 992 (9th Cir. 1999) (explaining that considering less
 22 drastic alternatives *before* the party has disobeyed a court order does not satisfy this factor);
 23 *accord Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 643 & n.4 (9th Cir. 2002) (explaining that "the
 24 persuasive force of" earlier Ninth Circuit cases that "implicitly accepted pursuit of less drastic
 25 alternatives prior to disobedience of the court's order as satisfying this element[,] i.e., like the
 26 "initial granting of leave to amend coupled with the warning of dismissal for failure to
 27 comply[,]" have been "eroded" by *Yourish*).

⁷ *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1424.

1 Setting another deadline is not a meaningful alternative given these circumstances. So the fifth
2 factor favors dismissal.

3 Having thoroughly weighed these dismissal factors, I find that they weigh in favor of
4 dismissal. IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that **THIS ACTION IS DISMISSED** without
5 prejudice based on the plaintiff's failure to pay the filing fee or seek to proceed in forma pauperis
6 in compliance with the court's January 27, 2023, order. The Clerk of Court is directed to
7 **ENTER JUDGMENT** accordingly and **CLOSE THIS CASE**. If plaintiff Shararlo Tinch
8 wishes to pursue his claims, he must file a complaint in a new case, and he must pay the fee for
9 that action or file a complete application to proceed in forma pauperis.

10 Dated: May 5, 2023

11 
12 U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23